UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/710,925	08/12/2004	Carl Oppedahl	O&L.P-005-2	4924

21121 7590 09/06/2006

OPPEDAHL AND LARSON LLP
P O BOX 5068
DILLON, CO 80435-5068

EXAMINER
MORRISON, JAY A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2168	

DATE MAILED: 09/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/710,925	OPPEDAHL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jay A. Morrison	2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 August 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-69* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-69* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *12 August 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *7/14/05 & 3/31/05*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-69 are pending.

Specification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-2,3,4,5,6,7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "available images" in line 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the derived information" in line 13. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the received information of interest" in line 15. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the newly available image or images" in lines 16-17. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "the images" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "the information" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "the received information of interest" in lines 2-3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 4 recites the limitation "the information" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 5 recites the limitation "the information" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 6 recites the limitation "the received information of interest" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 7 recites the limitation "the newly available image or images" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 7 recites the limitation "the recipient" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant “a recipient”.

These lack of antecedent basis problems are similarly repeated in every independent claim and the respective claims that depend therefrom; appropriate correction is required.

Note: the art rejections are made given the best understanding given the presented claims, which are difficult to interpret because of the abundance of assumptions were required due to their drafting.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. Claims 1,6-9,11-14,19,23-24,26,28,32-33,35-39,44,48-49,51-54,59,63-64,66-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims do not recite a practical application by producing a physical transformation or producing a useful, concrete, and tangible result. To perform a physical transformation, the claimed invention must transform an article or physical object into a different state or thing. Transformation of data is not a physical transformation. A useful, concrete, and tangible result must be either specifically recited in the claim or flow inherently therefrom. To be useful the claimed invention must establish a specific, substantial, and credible utility. To be concrete the claimed invention must be able to produce the same results given the same initial starting conditions. To be tangible the claimed invention must produce a practical application or real world result. In this case the claims fail to perform a physical transformation because the claims are directed to operating on data. The claims are useful and

concrete, but they fail to produce a tangible result because no result is stored to non-volatile media or, for example, reported to a user.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1,3,6-7,9,13-20,23-24,28-29,32-33,37-45,48-49,53-60,63-64,67-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gonzalez et al. ('Gonzalez' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,260,041).

As per claim 1, Gonzalez teaches

A method for use with a server serving requested records among a multiplicity of records, and with a predetermined list of record identifiers, and with a first file containing information about records corresponding to the record identifiers, the method comprising the steps of: (see abstract and background)

selecting at least two of the record identifiers from the list; (resources, column 3, lines 54-65)

for each one record identifier of the record identifiers: by means of a stored program, presenting a request to the server with respect to the record identifier; (for each resource, column 3, lines 60-65)

receiving a record from the server, said record corresponding to the record identifier; (download data, column 3, lines 60-65)

parsing the record by means of a stored program, thereby deriving received information from the record indicative of available images; (examination, column 4, lines 3-10)

by means of a stored program, comparing the derived information with corresponding information in the first file; (examination, column 4, lines 3-33)

and in response to any difference between the received information of interest and the corresponding information in the first file, obtaining the newly available image or images. (returned, column 4, lines 21-30)

As per claim 3, Gonzalez teaches

the step, performed after the parsing step, of replacing the information in the first file with the received information of interest. (column 4, lines 35-46)

As per claim 6, Gonzalez teaches

annunciating any difference between the received information of interest and the corresponding information in the first file. (column 4, lines 47-61)

As per claim 7, Gonzalez teaches

the annunciating step further comprises emailing the newly available image or images to the recipient. (column 3, lines 27-41)

As per claim 9, Gonzalez teaches

the server is a hypertext transfer protocol server, and the presenting and receiving steps are performed according to a hypertext transfer protocol. (column 2, lines 60-66)

As per claim 13, Gonzalez teaches

the record identifiers are patent application serial numbers. (resources, column 3, lines 54-65; note: record identifiers being patent application serial numbers in no way changes the functionality of the claim, and in effect just reflect intended use. Minton v. Nat 'l Ass 'n of Securities Dealers, Inc., 336 F.3d 1373, 1381, 67 USPQ2d 1614, 1620 (Fed. Cir. 2003) "whereby clause in a method claim is not given weight when it simply expresses the intended result of a process step positively recited." Examples of claim language, although not exhaustive, that may raise a question as to the limiting effect of the language in a claim are: (A) "adapted to" or "adapted for " clauses; (B) "wherein" clauses; and (C) "whereby" clauses. Therefore intended use limitations are not required to be taught, see MPEP § 2106 Section II(C), MPEP 2111.04 [R-3])

As per claim 14, Gonzalez teaches

the record identifiers are trademark application serial numbers. (resources, column 3, lines 54-65; note: record identifiers being trademark application serial numbers in no way changes the functionality of the claim, and in effect just reflect intended use. Minton v. Nat 'l Ass 'n of Securities Dealers, Inc., 336 F.3d 1373, 1381, 67 USPQ2d 1614, 1620 (Fed. Cir. 2003) "whereby clause in a method claim is not given weight when it simply expresses the intended result of a process step positively recited." Examples of claim language, although not exhaustive, that may raise a question as to the limiting effect of the language in a claim are: (A) "adapted to" or "adapted for " clauses; (B) "wherein" clauses; and (C) "whereby" clauses. Therefore intended use limitations are not required to be taught, see MPEP § 2106 Section II(C), MPEP 2111.04 [R-3])

As per claim 15, Gonzalez teaches

requesting from the server all record identifiers matching a predetermined criterion, and adding any new record identifiers to the first file. (column 4, line 62 through column 5, line 4)

As per claim 16, Gonzalez teaches

annunciating any new record identifiers. (column 4, line 62 through column 5, line 4)

As per claim 17, Gonzalez teaches

the annunciating of new record identifiers comprises sending an email message. (column 3, lines 27-41)

As per claim 18, Gonzalez teaches

the predetermined criterion comprises matching a customer number. (resources, column 3, lines 54-65; note: use of a customer number in no way changes the functionality of the claim as the customer number is just equivalent to any other data and is not otherwise distinguished, and in effect just reflects intended use. Minton v. Nat 'l Ass 'n of Securities Dealers, Inc., 336 F.3d 1373, 1381, 67 USPQ2d 1614, 1620 (Fed. Cir. 2003) "whereby clause in a method claim is not given weight when it simply expresses the intended result of a process step positively recited." Examples of claim language, although not exhaustive, that may raise a question as to the limiting effect of the language in a claim are: (A) "adapted to" or "adapted for " clauses; (B) "wherein" clauses; and (C) "whereby" clauses. Therefore intended use limitations are not required to be taught, see MPEP § 2106 Section II(C), MPEP 2111.04 [R-3])

As per claim 19,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected.

As per claim 20,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 3 and is similarly rejected.

As per claim 23,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 6 and is similarly rejected.

As per claim 24,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 9 and is similarly rejected.

As per claim 28, Gonzalez teaches

A method for use with a server serving requested records among a multiplicity of records, and with a predetermined list of record identifiers, and with a first file containing information about records corresponding to the record identifiers, the method comprising the steps of: (see abstract and background)

selecting at least two of the record identifiers from the list; (resources, column 3, lines 54-65)

for each one record identifier of the record identifiers: by means of a stored program, presenting a request to the server with respect to the record identifier; (for each resource, column 3, lines 60-65)

receiving a record from the server, said record corresponding to the record identifier; (download data, column 3, lines 60-65)

by means of a stored program, parsing the record, thereby deriving received information of interest from the record; (examination, column 4, lines 3-10)

by means of a stored program, comparing the received information of interest with corresponding information in the first file; (examination, column 4, lines 3-33)

and by means of a stored program annunciating any difference between the received information of interest and the corresponding information in the first file. (returned, column 4, lines 21-30)

As per claim 29,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 3 and is similarly rejected.

As per claim 32,

the annunciating step further comprises sending an email to a recipient. (column 3, lines 27-41)

As per claim 33,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 9 and is similarly rejected.

As per claims 37-38,

These claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 13-14 and are similarly rejected.

As per claim 39, Gonzalez teaches

the record identifiers are package tracking numbers. (resources, column 3, lines 54-65; note: record identifiers being package tracking numbers in no way changes the functionality of the claim, and in effect just reflect intended use. Minton v. Nat'l Ass'n of Securities Dealers, Inc., 336 F.3d 1373, 1381, 67 USPQ2d 1614, 1620 (Fed. Cir. 2003) "whereby clause in a method claim is not given weight when it simply expresses the intended result of a process step positively recited." Examples of claim language, although not exhaustive, that may raise a question as to the limiting effect of the language in a claim are: (A) "adapted to" or "adapted for " clauses; (B) "wherein" clauses; and (C) "whereby" clauses. Therefore intended use limitations are not required to be taught, see MPEP § 2106 Section II(C), MPEP 2111.04 [R-3])

As per claims 40-43,

These claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 15-18 and are similarly rejected.

As per claim 44, Gonzalez teaches

A method for use with a server serving requested records among a multiplicity of records, and with a predetermined list of record identifiers, and with a first file containing information about records corresponding to the record identifiers, the method comprising the steps of: (see abstract and background)

selecting at least two of the record identifiers from the list; (resources, column 3, lines 54-65)

for each one record identifier of the record identifiers: by means of a stored program, presenting a request to the server with respect to the record identifier; (for each resource, column 3, lines 60-65)

receiving a record from the server, said record corresponding to the record identifier; (download data, column 3, lines 60-65)

parsing the record by means of a stored program, thereby deriving received information from the record indicative of available images; (examination, column 4, lines 3-10)

by means of a stored program, comparing the derived information with corresponding information in the first file; (examination, column 4, lines 3-33)

and in response to any difference between the received information of interest and the corresponding information in the first file, identifying a uniform resource locator for each of the newly available image or images. (returned, column 4, lines 21-30)

As per claim 45,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 3 and is similarly rejected.

As per claim 48, Gonzalez teaches

annunciating any difference between the received information of interest and the corresponding information in the first file wherein the annunciating further comprises sending an email to a recipient containing the uniform resource locator. (column 3, lines 27-41)

As per claim 49,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 9 and is similarly rejected.

As per claims 53-58,

These claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 13-18 and are similarly rejected.

As per claim 59,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 44 and is similarly rejected.

As per claim 60,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 3 and is similarly rejected.

As per claim 63, Gonzalez teaches

the second means further performs a step of annunciating any difference between the received information of interest and the corresponding information in the first file and wherein the annunciating further comprises sending email to a recipient including the uniform resource locator. (column 3, lines 27-41)

As per claim 64, Gonzalez teaches

the server is a hypertext transfer protocol server, and the presenting and receiving steps are performed according to a hypertext transfer protocol. (column 2, lines 60-66)

As per claim 67, Gonzalez teaches

A method for use with a server serving requested records among a multiplicity of records, and with a predetermined list of record identifiers, and with a first file containing information about records corresponding to the record identifiers, the method comprising the steps of: (see abstract and background)

selecting at least two of the record identifiers from the list; (resources, column 3, lines 54-65)

for each one record identifier of the record identifiers: by means of a stored program, presenting a request to the server with respect to the record identifier; (for each resource, column 3, lines 60-65)

receiving a record from the server, said record corresponding to the record identifier; (download data, column 3, lines 60-65)

by means of a stored program, parsing the record, thereby deriving received information of interest from the record; (examination, column 4, lines 3-10)

by means of a stored program, comparing the received information of interest with corresponding information in the first file; (examination, column 4, lines 3-33)

and by means of a stored program annunciating any difference between the received information of interest and the corresponding information in the first file. (returned, column 4, lines 21-30)

As per claim 68,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 39 and is similarly rejected.

As per claim 69,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 39 and is similarly rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 2,8,27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gonzalez et al. ('Gonzalez' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,260,041) in view of Wood (Patent Number 5,381,332).

As per claim 2,

Gonzalez does not explicitly indicate "there are two or more newly available images, further comprising the step of combining the images into a single multipage image file."

However, Wood discloses "there are two or more newly available images, further comprising the step of combining the images into a single multipage image file" (combine files, column 9, lines 48-52; note: images stored in files are just like any other data since no function is described to otherwise differentiate the data).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Gonzalez and Wood because using the steps of "there are two or more newly available images, further comprising the step of combining the images into a single multipage image file" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by merging all of the relevant data into a single file. This gives the user the advantage of not having to manage a multitude of data files.

As per claim 8, Gonzalez teaches

an annunciating step comprising emailing the single multipage image file to a recipient. (column 3, lines 27-41)

As per claim 27,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 2 and is similarly rejected.

11. Claims 11-12,26,35-36,51-52,66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gonzalez et al. ('Gonzalez' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,260,041) in view of Mendez et al. (Patent Number 5,968,131).

As per claim 11,

Gonzalez does not explicitly indicate "the presenting and receiving steps are performed by means of a cryptographically secure communications link with the server."

However, Mendez discloses "the presenting and receiving steps are performed by means of a cryptographically secure communications link with the server" (column 7, lines 10-15)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Gonzalez and Mendez because using the steps of "the presenting and receiving steps are performed by means of a cryptographically secure communications link with the server" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by ensuring that the communication is secure. This gives the user the advantage of not being concerned whether the data is being compromised.

As per claim 12, Gonzalez teaches

the server is a hypertext transfer protocol server, and the presenting and receiving steps are performed according to a hypertext transfer protocol. (column 2, lines 60-66)

As per claim 26,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 11 and is similarly rejected.

As per claim 35,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 11 and is similarly rejected.

As per claim 36, Gonzalez teaches

the server is a hypertext transfer protocol server, and the presenting and receiving steps are performed according to a hypertext transfer protocol. (column 2, lines 60-66)

As per claim 51,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 11 and is similarly rejected.

As per claim 52, Gonzalez teaches

the server is a hypertext transfer protocol server, and the presenting and receiving steps are performed according to a hypertext transfer protocol. (column 2, lines 60-66)

As per claim 66,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 11 and is similarly rejected.

12. Claims 4-5,10,21-22,25,30-31,34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gonzalez et al. ('Gonzalez' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,260,041) in view of Conrad et al. (Patent Number 6,028,605).

As per claim 4,

Gonzalez does not explicitly indicate "creating or updating an extensible markup language file containing the information in the first file."

However, Conrad discloses "creating or updating an extensible markup language file containing the information in the first file" (column 7, lines 1-10)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Gonzalez and Conrad because using the steps of "creating or updating an extensible markup language file containing the information in the first file" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by to conform to the various information system formats. This gives the user the advantage of being able to use the data on various systems.

As per claim 5,

Gonzalez does not explicitly indicate "creating or updating a hypertext markup language file containing the information in the first file."

However, Conrad discloses "creating or updating a hypertext markup language file containing the information in the first file" (column 7, lines 1-10)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Gonzalez and Conrad because using the steps of "creating or updating a hypertext markup language file containing the information in the first file" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by to conform to the various information system formats. This gives the user the advantage of being able to use the data on various systems.

As per claim 10, Gonzalez teaches

serving records in the hypertext markup language file on a hypertext transfer protocol server. (column 2, lines 60-66)

As per claims 21-22,

These claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 4-5 and are similarly rejected.

As per claim 25,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 10 and is similarly rejected.

As per claims 30-31,

These claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 4-5 and are similarly rejected.

As per claim 34,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 10 and is similarly rejected.

13. Claims 46-47,50,61-62,65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gonzalez et al. ('Gonzalez' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,260,041) in view of Conrad et al. ('Conrad' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,028,605) and further in view of Gupta et al. ('Gupta' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,484,156).

As per claim 46,

Gonzalez does not explicitly indicate "creating or updating an extensible markup language file containing the information in the first file."

However, Conrad discloses "creating or updating an extensible markup language file containing the information in the first file" (column 7, lines 1-10)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Gonzalez and Conrad because using the steps of "creating or updating an extensible markup language file containing the information in the first file" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by to conform to the various information system formats. This gives the user the advantage of being able to use the data on various systems.

Gonzalez does not explicitly indicate "and embedding the uniform resource locator in the extensible markup language file."

However, Gupta discloses "and embedding the uniform resource locator in the extensible markup language file" (column 6, lines 6-15)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Gonzalez, Conrad and Gupta because using the steps of "and embedding the uniform resource locator in the extensible markup language file" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing quick access the pertinent data with a single request. This gives the user the advantage of not having to do a lot of work to view the pertinent data.

As per claim 47,

Gonzalez does not explicitly indicate "creating or updating a hypertext markup language file containing the information in the first file."

However, Conrad discloses "creating or updating a hypertext markup language file containing the information in the first file" (column 7, lines 1-10)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Gonzalez and Conrad because using the steps of "creating or updating a hypertext markup language file containing the information in the first file" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by to conform to the various information system formats. This gives the user the advantage of being able to use the data on various systems.

Gonzalez does not explicitly indicate "and embedding the uniform resource locator in the hypertext markup language file."

However, Gupta discloses "and embedding the uniform resource locator in the hypertext markup language file" (column 6, lines 6-15)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Gonzalez, Conrad and Gupta because using the steps of "and embedding the uniform resource locator in the hypertext markup language file" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing quick access the pertinent data with a single request. This gives the user the advantage of not having to do a lot of work to view the pertinent data.

As per claim 50, Gonzalez teaches

serving records in the hypertext markup language file on a hypertext transfer protocol server. (column 2, lines 60-66)

As per claim 61, Gonzalez teaches

"for each of the newly available image or images" (column 4, lines 21-30).

Gonzalez does not explicitly indicate "the second means further performs the step of creating or updating an extensible markup language file containing the information in the first file."

However, Conrad discloses "the second means further performs the step of creating or updating an extensible markup language file containing the information in the first file" (column 7, lines 1-10)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Gonzalez and Conrad because using the steps of "the second means further performs the step of creating or updating an extensible markup language file containing the information in the first file" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by to conform to the various information system formats. This gives the user the advantage of being able to use the data on various systems.

Gonzalez does not explicitly indicate "and embedding the uniform resource locator in the extensible markup language file."

However, Gupta discloses "and embedding the uniform resource locator in the extensible markup language file" (column 6, lines 6-15)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Gonzalez, Conrad and Gupta because using the steps of "and embedding the uniform resource locator in the extensible markup language file" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing quick access the pertinent data with a single request. This gives the user the advantage of not having to do a lot of work to view the pertinent data.

As per claim 62, Gonzalez teaches

"for each of the newly available image or images" (column 4, lines 21-30).

Gonzalez does not explicitly indicate "the second means further performs the step of creating or updating a hypertext markup language file containing the information in the first file."

However, Conrad discloses "the second means further performs the step of creating or updating a hypertext markup language file containing the information in the first file" (column 7, lines 1-10)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Gonzalez and Conrad because using the steps of "the second means further performs the step of creating or updating a hypertext markup language file containing the information in the first file" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by to conform to the various information system formats. This gives the user the advantage of being able to use the data on various systems.

Gonzalez does not explicitly indicate "and embedding the uniform resource locator in the hypertext markup language file."

However, Gupta discloses "and embedding the uniform resource locator in the hypertext markup language file" (column 6, lines 6-15)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Gonzalez, Conrad and Gupta because using the steps of "and embedding the uniform resource locator in the hypertext markup language file" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing

quick access the pertinent data with a single request. This gives the user the advantage of not having to do a lot of work to view the pertinent data.

As per claim 65, Gonzalez teaches

a hypertext transfer protocol server serving records in the hypertext markup language file. (column 2, lines 60-66)

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jay A. Morrison whose telephone number is (571) 272-7112. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on (571) 272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TIM VO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Jay Morrison
TC2100

Tim Vo
TC2100